

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/768,088	IIZUKA, KEN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tsung-Yin Tsai	2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tsung-Yin Tsa (Examiner)i. (3) Edward Tracy (Agent 47998).  
 (2) Jingge Wu (SPE)). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wendt (US 2002/0090109 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JINGGE WU  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 1 was discluss regarding correlation between the first corrected image and second image, where Atty Tracy stated that Wendt does not teach regarding correlation of the first and the second image; where there is no matching to the second image. Office pointed out where Wendt disclose a correlation device for the function of correlation for the function of comparing, but the Office will take wha tAtty Tracy stated into further consideration after the respond by the Applicant to the Final Rejection.

Art Unit: 2624